8th August 1929]

The hon. Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" The Government have no reason to believe that the High Court has not taken the necessary steps."

## Forests

*Memorial from the villagers of Vangal in the Trichinopoly district about their forest grievances.*

* 98 Q.—Mr. S. SATYAMURTI : Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether he has received any memorial from the villagers of Vangal in the Trichinopoly district about their forest grievances ; and

(*b*) what action the Government propose to take in the matter ?

*A.*—(*a*) No such memorial has been received.

(*b*) Does not arise.

*Removal of the reserve boundary line away from the holdings of the ryots in South Kanara.*

* 99 Q.—Mr. A. B. SHETTY : Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state whether the Government have at any time considered the question of removing the reserve boundary line half a mile or any distance away from the holdings of ryots in South Kanara ?

*A.*—Yes. The question was also considered in connexion with the budget debates of 1928–29. The policy of Government on the general question is contained in G.O. No. 30, Development, dated the 6th January 1922, which has been placed on the Editors' Table. In pursuance of that policy all legitimate grievances which were brought to notice have also received attention.

Mr. K. R. KARANT :—" May I know whether there has been any instance in the district in which the reserve boundary has been put back ? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" Notice, Sir."

Mr. J. A. SALDANHA :—" Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to lay on the table once again the Government Order which was placed on the table in the year 1922 ? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" I think it is unnecessary to do so."

Mr. K. R. KARANT :—" May I know whether the question of putting back the reserve boundaries was also one of the subjects included in the question of reorganization of the Forest Department ? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" That was not ; but the whole forest policy will be considered. This also along with the rest will be considered."

## Jails

*Age-limit for the detention of adolescents in Borstal schools.*

*100 Q.—Mr. F. E. JAMES : Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether in spite of the fact that 23 is regarded as the maximum age for the detention of adolescents in Borstal schools, certain courts continue to give sentences which necessitate detention in Borstal institutions beyond this age-limit ; and